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The debates and critiques of #CommunicationSoWhite have arisen as responses to troubling academic and political contexts, which are complexly intertwined. We are in the midst of widespread expansion and ascendance of white supremacy globally, as disturbingly evident in the trajectories, rhetoric, and actions of Donald Trump in the United States, the United Kingdom’s Boris Johnson, and the Golden Dawn in Greece, alongside the growing power of right-wing and authoritarian regimes more generally: China under Xi, India under Modi, Brazil under Bolsonaro, and others. At this moment of such cultural and political crises, a critical mass of scholars, recognizing the centrality of media and communication in facilitating these shifts, is increasingly speaking back, intervening in, and reshaping our field. #CommunicationSoWhite is an intervention that calls into focus the complicity of the academy in perpetuating existing racial and intersecting hierarchies. By drawing attention to race, inequality, and exclusion, we highlight the importance of engaging questions on power, identity, and politics in communication and media studies. Tensions and, in some cases, conflicts arising from our field’s persistent inequities are urgent signs that our professional organizations, institutions, and the entire discipline must undertake transformative changes.

One key moment: the experiences of multiple scholars of color who faced racism and white supremacist threats in May 2018 at the International Communication Association conference in Prague raised questions about how to combat racial terror, threats, and US/Eurocentrism encountered within our discipline. Later that month, a social media discussion that included Al
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Martin, Eve Ng, Anamik Saha, and Khadijah White reflected further on these issues. In the wake of Chakravartty, Kuo, Grubbs, & McIlwain’s (2018) “#CommunicationSoWhite” article, Saha, White, Ng, and Martin decided to organize a program for the 2019 conference that explicitly addressed racial and intersecting hierarchies in communication studies. A longer-range goal was also for ICA’s leadership to more actively tackle these issues at the organizational level.

The challenges of bringing the pre-conference to fruition are instructive about the conditions of the field more generally. The organizers contacted the five ICA divisions with the most sessions allocated to them (at least 37; the largest had 61) and the largest budgets available for the 2018 conference. We asked the division chairs and vice-chairs if they would dedicate one of their main conference sessions to the #CommunicationSoWhite theme and whether they could provide any financial support towards the pre-conference, as we saw the topic as highly pertinent to all scholarly areas in communication. Almost every response from the leadership of these divisions was a firm, polite “no” for both requests, frequently accompanied by comments that the division was already addressing issues of inequality or diversity and inclusion through their existing programming. Ultimately, of the five largest divisions, only the Communication and Technology division co-sponsored by providing a session for a #CommunicationSoWhite panel in the main conference, while the Mass Communication division provided financial support of $250. The pre-conference budget therefore came largely from the medium-sized and smaller sections, with the Ethnicity and Race in Communication division and the LGBTQ Studies interest group providing $750 and $600 respectively, which together comprised over half of the total budget.
We present these details not to impugn the motivations of particular ICA divisions, their chairs and vice-chairs, or ICA’s executive leadership, but as an example how hegemonically white institutions can remain resistant to change. To make a bold analogy, there have been more calls for reparations to redress the immense levels of exploitation, ongoing systemic marginalization of people of African descent, and other structural inequalities associated with slavery in the U.S. context and elsewhere (e.g. Human Rights Watch, 2019; Kunnie, 2018), as well as for Indigenous peoples stripped of their lands and sovereignty (see Erueti, 2016; United Nations Human Rights Council, 2019). To put it plainly, then, real resources are needed alongside goodwill and moral support; systemic disenfranchisement must be tackled with systemic redress, and one way this could happen within communication and media studies is for the most well-resourced pockets of our discipline to play larger roles in sharing those resources.

With the support that the organizers did secure, the 2019 ICA #CommunicationSoWhite pre-conference was held in Washington D.C. on May 24; it was accompanied by two #CommunicationSoWhite-themed sessions in the main conference, one organized by Ng and co-sponsored by the CAT division, and the other an ICA-wide sponsored session put forward by Paula Chakravartty and Charlton McIlwain. These events were intended to spur conversations that continue in multiple spaces, and White, Saha, and Ng moved forward as editors of this Communication, Culture, and Critique “#CommunicationSoWhite” special issue with this goal in mind. We wanted the contributions here to reflect the scope of topics discussed during the pre-conference and main conference, and for them to be available to a wider audience. Although journal length considerations constrained how many articles could be included, there are five full
papers, an interview essay, and five Forum essays, with the contributors being collectively drawn from both the pre-conference and the main conference #CommunicationSoWhite sessions.

We recognize that this pool for the special issue constitutes a critical limitation, not least because the majority of contributors are based in the U.S. Even though the pre-conference call for papers encouraged “participation by submitters from outside North America and the U.K.,” only eight out of the 31 presenters were based outside of these two regions, in Australia, Brazil, Germany, and Kenya. This is unsurprising given that the pre-conference was held on the east coast of the U.S. Yet the location of the pre-conference and main conference is no coincidence, as Ng and Gardner (2020) discuss in this issue; it is integral to the postcolonial inequities of place and race in academia. We have not, in other words, been able to escape the Euro-U.S.-centricity that is one central thread in recent critiques about the field (e.g. see Hegde & Shome, 2002; Shome, 2016; Yue, 2014).

At the same time, in identifying North/South disparities, we also recognize that intersectional hierarchies stratify the global North. Even as we call for more inclusion of scholars of color from around the world, shared resistance, transnational solidarities, and coalition-building are key to navigating and constructing the academy, which reproduces and reifies systems of oppression through our research methods, hiring, and recognition. Within the ivory towers of the global North, faculty of color are increasingly contingent and frequently isolated. For example, in the U.S., Black and Latino professors each make up only about 7% of full-time faculty, but over 13% and 18% of the US population respectively (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018; US Census Bureau, 2019). In the U.K., there was a country-wide total of only 25 Black women
professors in 2019, but more than 10,000 white male professors (Rollock, 2019). Thus, it is significant that 17 of the 23 pre-conference presenters based in the U.S., Canada, and the U.K. are scholars of color, as are seven of the eight other presenters and five of the (non-presenter) session chairs. With white cis-gendered heterosexual men the most over-represented in communication studies citations (Chakravartty et al., 2018; Mayer, Press, Verhoeven, & Sterne, 2018), making and claiming spaces for people of color and other voices traditionally marginalized in Western academic spaces, including feminist, queer, and Indigenous scholars, is also a key goal of #CommunicationSoWhite’s critique.

It is worth revisiting what the “white” in “#CommunicationSoWhite” refers to. Chakravartty et al. (2018) make clear that they approach race not as an inherent attribute of any one individual and by no means confined to the way the U.S.’s long history of racism is often reduced to Black-white racial dichotomies, but as a sociopolitical construction that must be understood through historical and contemporary axes of domination, where “global racial hierarchies … inform a dynamic, relational conceptualization of race where racial differences are articulated across lines of skin color, ethnicity, class, and caste” (p. 255). Also looking beyond individual identities, Gardner (2018) argues that it is not enough for ICA’s internationalization efforts to “simply cross borders to accumulate new members”; instead, it is necessary “to reimagine our normative ways of doing research” (p. 832), attentive to how subordinate groups tend to be homogenized in ways that exacerbate their marginalization, as well as “how historical legacies (e.g., of colonialism or gender bias) produce slippery new practices of marginalization” (p. 833).
We recognize that the transformative potential of “diversity” efforts has been increasingly diluted through the cooptation of the term to simplistically refer to the presence of black or brown individuals—on a faculty, for example—with scant regard for complex intersections of nation, class, caste, and religion, or without genuine reflexivity or intent for structural change.

Highlighting the problematic Western dominance of communication scholarship should not sideline important racial and colonial critiques, including those generated by marginalized scholars in the West about white supremacy as a dominant global ideology. Such contributions in contexts where people of color occupy a minoritarian status – the U.S. and the UK, for example – have been foundational to university-based Racial and Ethnic Studies, and have shifted the lexicons and methods of entire disciplines.

Thus, advocating for greater global South representation and for more diversity of gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, class, etc. within the global North is not a zero-sum game; rather, these endeavors invite crucial coalitional mobilizations advocated by activists and scholars for social justice (e.g. see Cohen, 1997; Chávez, 2013). A larger history of anti-colonial, pan-African, and indigenous struggles around the world have drawn attention to the key ways that white supremacy, racial hierarchies, and colonialism have organized, defined, and continue to devalue the contributions of marginalized people, regardless of their minoritarian or majoritarian status.

We recognize the lessons learned from Black feminist and third world scholars who push for solidarity and organizing among subaltern groups across and inside national boundaries.

As we see it, #CommunicationSoWhite is expansive enough a keyword to address these issues in myriad ways. Indebted to critical race studies and other scholarship attentive to power, including
cultural studies and feminist and queer theory, its critique of communication studies links it to earlier work that exposed the academy as steeped in inequalities (e.g. Acker, Wagner, & Mayuzumi, 2008; Wiegman, 1997). As a clarion call for recognizing the inextricable relationship of the scholarly and the political, #CommunicationSoWhite also ties to a broad swath of work that demands examining not just content – whether theory or data – but practices. Indeed, academic practices in research, hiring, evaluating, training, citing, and celebrating provide crucial contexts from which theory and data emerge.

In Chakravartty et al. (2018), the focus was on citational practices and the structural inequalities of journal publication, and this thread is continued by de Albuquerque, de Oliveira, dos Santos, and de Albuquerque (2020), who discuss how the journals included in Clarivate’s Journal of Citation Reports Communications list and the composition of their editorial boards skew significantly to Western and especially U.S. institutions, findings that the authors situate within broader conditions of “academic capitalism” and postcolonial global asymmetries. Examining a different body of scholarly publications, Manning (2020) discusses how commonly used interpersonal communication textbooks center whiteness as the norm even as they include select examples of racial and ethnic “diversity.” There are also critiques of other practices and spaces of communication scholarship. Reviewing the factors informing ICA’s determination of conference venues, Ng and Gardner (2020) argue that ICA’s membership must consider the postcolonial privileges of place when the annual conference is more accessible to those in the global North, and be open to changes that would make holding the conference elsewhere viable. McAllister, Jiwani, and Hirji (2020) examine Canadian communication studies through a review of university department faculty composition and contributors to Canadian communication
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journals, uncovering a dominant whiteness tied to the nation’s basis as a settler colony, despite contemporary discourses of multicultural diversity. And taking a global lens, Chakravartty (2020) argues that the turn to ultra-nationalism in many nation-states is tied to increased repression of “minoritized academics” and scholars addressing “the interests of marginalized, and often racialized, populations,” underscoring the urgency of addressing racism within the intertwined of contested knowledge production and politics.

The articles also present strategies for reframing or pushing back against dominant modes of scholarship. Discussing Twitter data showing that user engagement around the #CommunicationSoWhite hashtag in 2019 was dominated by people of color, Murthy (2020) calls for white scholars to be more actively engaged in addressing racial inequities, not just online but in practices such as mentoring students of color. Phillips and Verhoeven (2020) draw on Australian Indigenous perspectives to propose an approach of “relationality,” different from much communication scholarship, that takes account of place and “lifeworld data” in designing and interpreting research. Sobande and Osei (2020) identify how Black women’s media and aesthetic practices have historically been marginalized, and argue for centering Black women’s “agency, joy and resistance” in media studies rather than their oppression and trauma. Examining three digital syllabi addressing white supremacy and racial injustice in the U.S., Clark (2020) discusses how these comprise critical communication praxis and provide examples of how to conduct critical public pedagogy.

Also significant to contemporary strategies of resistance and transformation is recognizing key historical developments in the field. In White’s (2020) interview essay interrogating knowledge
production in the academy, senior Black communication scholars Herman Gray and Oscar Gandy reflect on a variety of processes affecting the construction of center and margins, including those that “anoint” and allocate prestige as well as practices such as community building amongst minority scholars that challenge dominant academic power. And, in an article excavating the “ethno-racial encounters” of early Western communication theory, Mukherjee (2020) traces the genealogy of Frankfurt School scholarship to highlight “how questions of race and ethno-racial difference are embedded among the formative influences on the discipline,” at the same time providing an extensive number of citations highlighting communication research by scholars of color. In such ways, we acknowledge important legacies without acquiescing to them the power to define the future of the field.

In closing, we want to acknowledge that we, the co-editors of this issue, speak from positions of relative privilege, as scholars employed in full-time tenure-track or tenured positions in the U.S. (Ng and White) and the U.K. (Saha). Still, this has not completely shielded us from threats to labor conditions or even to the existence of our academic units, and we work with colleagues with contingent appointments under even greater pressures from the corporatization of the university. Indeed, the precarity of academic employment intersects with hierarchies of race, ethnicity, nation, religion, gender, sexuality, class, etc. As Chakravartty et al. (2018) mentioned (citing the work of other scholars), contingent labor in academia “has been disproportionately shouldered by women and people of color” (p. 257). On this note, we would therefore underscore the point that the goal cannot simply be increasing the number of diverse scholars in academic units, but rather, substantially transforming these spaces so that they do not subject racialized bodies to greater forms of discipline than their white counterparts (Ahmed, 2012; Puwar, 2004).
To reiterate, the political forces around the globe being marshalled against subordinated groups and the surge of rightwing populism, especially as they manifest as xenophobic, Islamophobic, white supremacist discourse (e.g. see Titley, 2019; Valluvan, 2019), crucially comprise the contexts critiqued by #CommunicationSoWhite. Yet there have also been recent reasons for optimism, including new arenas of engagement that directly address pertinent issues. For example, one digital space that emerged after the pre-conference is the Communication Scholars for Transformation Facebook page, initially established in response to the National Communication Association’s Distinguished Scholars controversy. An editorial written by Martin Medhurst, editor of Rhetoric & Public Affairs, against NCA’s recent policy initiatives to increase the diversity of its designated “Distinguished Scholars,” drew immediate criticism. This series of events has been helpfully summarized by others and deliberated more extensively in a special “Merit, Whiteness, and Privilege” issue of Departures in Critical Qualitative Research (Rodriguez, Dutta, & Desnoyers-Colas, 2019), so here we simply note that their occurrence demonstrates how entrenched opposition to structural change can be from those who have traditionally benefitted from the status quo; yet the rapid mobilization of critiques, including a protest letter of response and multiple official statements of support for these critiques from NCA divisions and others, also show the strength and depth amongst communication scholars committed to addressing systemic inequalities of the field. In themselves, bursts of heightened attention to egregious incidents are insufficient; it is therefore also significant that, in the second half of 2019, new task forces with similar mandates were established within ICA (the Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Access Task Force), NCA (the Diversifying Knowledge Task Force), and the Society for Cinema and Media Studies (the Anti-
Racism Task Force). It remains to be seen what these efforts produce in terms of significant transformation; certainly, the barometer seems to have shifted in the right direction for now, but the lessons of history and our current conditions demonstrate that nothing can be taken for granted. With an array of #CommunicationSoWhite analyses from predominantly scholars of color, this special issue will hopefully spur further conversation and action on addressing race, racism, white supremacy, and other persistent structures of inequality in our field, and their manifestations in the world more broadly.
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